

To: "Robert Law" [rlaw@demaximis.com]
Cc: CN=Alice Yeh/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;CN=Eugenia Naranjo/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;jconnolly@anchorqea.com;"Mike Barbara" [mab.consulting@verizon.net]; N=Eugenia Naranjo/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;jconnolly@anchorqea.com;"Mike Barbara" [mab.consulting@verizon.net]; connolly@anchorqea.com;"Mike Barbara" [mab.consulting@verizon.net]; Mike Barbara" [mab.consulting@verizon.net]; Willard Potter" [otto@demaximis.com]; N=Ray Basso/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA;"Rafael Canizares" [RCanizares@moffattnichol.com]; Rafael Canizares" [RCanizares@moffattnichol.com]; garland@hydroqual.com;"Wands, James" [James.Wands@hdrinc.com]; Wands, James" [James.Wands@hdrinc.com]
From: CN=Stephanie Vaughn/OU=R2/O=USEPA/C=US
Sent: Thur 9/6/2012 5:38:10 PM
Subject: Re: Next LPR/NB model collaboration meeting-> Sept 25?

Hi Rob,

Thank you for sending a draft agenda for the September 25 modeling collaboration meeting. We are reviewing it and will let you know if we have any comments or suggestions.

As we have discussed, I understand that the CPG is concerned that it is not receiving definitive and clear feedback from the EPA modeling team on how to proceed. However, as we have also discussed, it is difficult for EPA to provide formal, documented feedback on what the CPG team is doing without having some documentation to comment upon. To this end, we propose taking the following approach, most of which we have already spoken about:

1. For all future modeling collaboration meetings, the CPG will prepare a draft meeting summary for EPA review and input (EPA will also take notes to assist in our review). The summary will include the items that were discussed, any agreements that were made, questions that came up, and a list of action items for both the EPA and the CPG teams to work on. This way, information discussed during the meeting will not be lost, and actions can be prioritized to help move the model forward in an efficient way. The modeling work plan can and should be used to help guide our efforts.
2. The meeting summaries will include copies of all presentations given at the meetings, and will be prepared in a timely basis.
3. To assist with EPA's review of the their progress, and provide something about which EPA can formally comment, the CPG will prepare a technical memorandum which summarizes the status of the CPG's modeling efforts through the end of September. The memo will include the latest set of inputs and source code that the CPG is using. A draft of this memo should be available for EPA review in October.
4. Keep in mind that any approval of the Sediment Transport Model is tentative until confirmed/verified with the contaminant fate model, and revision of both models may end up being an iterative process.

We can discuss the details of this path forward at the September 25 modeling meeting. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks,
Stephanie
212-637-3914

From: "Robert Law" <rlaw@demaximis.com>
To: Alice Yeh/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Eugenia Naranjo/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Stephanie Vaughn/R2/USEPA/US@EPA

Cc: <jconnolly@anchorage.com>, "Willard Potter" <otto@demaximis.com>, Ray Basso/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, "Rafael Canizares" <RCanizares@moffatnichol.com>, "Mike Barbara" <mab.consulting@verizon.net>
Date: 08/30/2012 02:55 PM
Subject: Re: Next LPR/NB model collaboration meeting-> Sept 25?

I think we would suggest an agenda that includes the following; I will work with the CPG Modeling Team to further refine the agenda.

I. CPG Presentation

1. CPG Progress

- * Sediment transport modeling update
- * Refined analysis of bathymetric differencing
- * Incorporation of simplified organic carbon tracking in the contaminant fate model
- * Response to EPA comments at the last meeting

2. CPG Areas of Current Focus

- * Impact of tidal erosion/deposition on contaminants in the parent bed
- * Refinement of TSS and contaminant boundary conditions based on CWCM data
- * Refinement of sediment initial conditions based on SSP data and bathymetric difference mapping

3. Anticipated problems

II. EPA Presentation

1. FFS modeling status - Peer Review, Current Predictions, Ongoing work etc.
2. RI/FS Oversight Review of CPG sediment transport modeling
3. Comments on CPG analysis of 2008 bathymetry data

The CPG is concerned that the CPG modeling team is not receiving definitive and clear feedback from the EPA modeling team on some of the modeling work related to the RI/FS. The CPG modeling team has presented several issues and proposed solutions for those issues and it is unclear that we are getting the type of RI/FS oversight feedback that the CPG routinely receives on other aspects of the RI/FS. As such, we need to discuss how to include a process where the CPG team is getting actual documented feedback on the modeling work that CPG is conducting - I think this was one of the original intentions of the Modeling Collaboration Meetings but the meetings seem to be more related to isolated technical issues (albeit important in most cases) rather than advancing and completing the model program in timely manner. We have added Item II.2 to make sure that we can get that feedback and becomes a routine part of these meetings.

Thank you.

R/
Rob

Robert Law, Ph.D.
de maximis, inc.
rlaw@demaximis.com
Voice: 908-735-9315

Fax: 908-735-2132>>> Eugenia Naranjo <Naranjo.Eugenia@epamail.epa.gov> 8/23/2012 4:28 PM >>>
Rob,

I just wanted to confirm that we are having our next model collaboration meeting on Tuesday September

25 in Mahwah.

There are a couple of items that we would like to discuss:

- update on Organic Carbon Simplification, Jim Fitzpatrick will be joining us for that part of the discussion
- status of bed layer sensitivity analysis for RCATOX
- any new update on Han's bathymetry analysis since we last met

Thank you,

Eugenia

Eugenia Naranjo
United States Environmental Protection Agency
290 Broadway
New York, NY 10007-1866
212-637-3467
Naranjo.Eugenia@epa.gov